

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
VALDOSTA DIVISION**

WASEEM DAKER,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO.: 7:20-CV-113 (LAG) (ALS)
	:	
TIMOTHY WARD, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	

---

**ORDER**

Before the Court is *pro se* Plaintiff Waseem Daker’s Motion for Reconsideration, filed on October 24, 2024. (Doc. 86). Therein, Plaintiff asks the Court to reconsider its November 3, 2021 Order and Judgment (Docs. 15–16). (*Id.* at 1). Pursuant to Local Rule 7.6, “Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice.” M.D. Ga. L.R. 7.6. The Court, “in both civil and criminal cases, . . . [will] grant a motion for reconsideration only when the movant timely demonstrates that either: 1) there has been an intervening change in the law; 2) new and previously unavailable evidence has been discovered through the exercise of due diligence; or 3) the Court made a clear error of law.” *United States v. Lauderdale*, 2016 WL 3232965 at \*2 (M.D. Ga. May 19, 2016) (citations omitted). Plaintiff moves for reconsideration under Rule 59(e). (Doc. 86 at 5). Motions filed pursuant to Rule 59(e) must be filed no later than 28 days after the entry of judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). Plaintiff did not file the October 24, 2024 Motion for Reconsideration within the 28 days required by Rule 59(e). Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 86) is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 21st day of January, 2025.

/s/ Leslie A. Gardner  
**LESLIE A. GARDNER, CHIEF JUDGE**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**